

8/11/71

Dear Paul,

Relet 7/30, I wrote you and Sylvia after reading again her M of O piece on the Texas correspondence asking for copies. She didn't have. I do not recall that you replied. Because I never got answered for months, when HR was here I asked him to get me what he could. The things he got are in the longrr list I sent. I tehn checked file when I was there, found in i what they didn't ell him about, didn't send him, and I ordered 7/24, with no response since. If and when that order gets here, those are the only pages I have. I recall you did tell me it is in the library microfilm, but I also want to establish what should be in the Archives. Do we know that the mirco is complete? And, without having had time to organize that printout it is cheaper to buy these few pages than waste all the time it would take to find even if I have it. Time presses more heavily on me than I think you can realize. I hate to waste any and much is wasted for me by things and those over which and whom I have no control.

On CD1108, I ordered only the five pages in CA 2 Texas, ~~pages~~ 10-11;26-8. Is there anything else of value or pote tial value in that CD? You speak of the file we have. You now have a list of what I have or have ordered. What else do "we" have?

I am aware of the interpretation of the AG's memo but do not regard it as either binding or trustworthy and as serving selfish prosecutive interests, which are pretty much the same regardless of how red or blue the jellyfish blood. By now the error in parts, i.e. ~~AddeXXXX~~ "does not permit", has been established by my 7-8-70, which forced Mitchell to interpret as discretionary power only. There are other requirements of availability, such as in pre-trial discovery proceedings. It is not alone Je cks, the only authority cited. I think you are in error in deciding that the question as it relates to Oswald is "academic". That is more likely to be the case with physics than with the law. LHO would or owuld not have had access, and if he would the requirement of the law is met. I think that there is no doubt that he would, the nature of the case perhaps imposing political tests atop the legal.

I have sent you everything I have of the past and which I just got that I didn't have re Pedro Charles. Anything else intrests me, esp. the lab work, which should have been done to begin with the frame being that obvious. It should have begun with the letter sent to Irving. I'll ask for CD897:311-2 when I ask for anything again, but with the special delayed-regurgitation memory hole they have for me, I know that unless something happens, it will take month I'll let you know if I do. meanwhile, should you order anything, would you please get these ~~it~~ two for me? In two weeks my last hasn't come 50 miles. And it was all in one identified folder, the only reason I didn't get it earlier being that the xerox was "bro en" when I was there!...Rush: I think all I meant was phone to remind, but if you can't, okay. I have sent you my nudge to TK. I had the entire film as it exists. Remember, you went back and questioned him for me after Turner fucked that up? The question is of stills, to whom he gave what when and who printed, etc. He probably doesn't know who edited out what is missing, but he did provide prints of some of those frames.

I don't think you meant "not bottle up your undertable frustration". I have it bottled and unless it explodes, so it will remain. But we just can't survive this and if I should explode, it will be memorable! If your reaction was mainly surprised you have made too complete an adjustment to the permeating amorality and immorality of some of "ours". Cook knew better from his review of FRANK-UP alone. And he has done other contemporaneous writing of similar stench given me by a TV reporter. In that he even used my chapter titles as sub-heads. He also had an ego-eating past on this subject...The piece by SI was for Texas Observer and depended on simultaneous appearance of some of Belin's vomit. It is on Jarman and lies. I saw a draft and suggested some changes. She is away through this month. Had a card today.

Your 7/31 to Eckhoff is excellent if it is for purposes of making a record only. Once that is done, we should be careful to avoid duplication. You know where I've been proceeding. On 2, regardless of what they have said, on some pp. violation privacy will apply. ~~h.~~ it is too bad you added the gravity of answering for them, unless you had some special purpose in mind. I would have been better for them to have claimed this and then for you to have

asked for a copy from another file/. 5. Reread that business of agency of paramount interest. Arch has obligation to refer and agency to which referred has obligation to regard as if it had been addressed to them to begin with. 6 is an item for which you might want to proceed under FOI and other law you will find in the memo Jim is to send you, I think 5 U.S.C.555. 7 is not an exemption that can be claimed under 5 U.S.C.552 and the guidelines cannot override the law. The only out I can conceive is if this La file was collected for law-enforcement purposes. If that is the case, which I doubt, then it can be argued the inv. file exemption binds. I made a request for appts of 9 in mid-1966 and was rejected. I didn't then feel it could be wise to carry it forward. I think this situation has been changed by time. I think in carrying this further, you should seek to learn if it is in her Manchester tapes. There is but one aspect that interests me, the testimony on the wounds and wounding, etc. You might next time consider adding Lobby's interpretation of Warren to Wozencraft. I think that adds to the doctrine. Also, Arch regs require that exemptions be waived except in the presence of compelling reasons. Thought I'd referred you to this in their own regs. Every once in a while I remember I have a separate file of Arch 'Corres, Others'. I have in this case remembered and filed there should we discuss further.

Nothing else really new, and none of letters of which you have copies answered.

Until you or I hear from JNS, I'm not carboning him.

Best,